

SECRET

17 MAY 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: 1968 Budget Review, 15 May 1967, attended by Representative Glenn Lipscomb, Appropriations Staff Officer Robert Michaels, and the following from CIA: Colonel White, Messrs. Warner, [redacted]  
[redacted]

25X1

A general presentation of the 1968 budget request was made by Colonel White who made use of the dollar and personnel charts in addition to the slides prepared for this purpose. A high degree of interest was evidenced by Mr. Lipscomb in the details which supported the House Notes furnished him earlier this year. There appeared to be several troublesome areas on which discussions were held:

1. With respect to intelligence research studies and analyses, is it possible to assure that the results of these efforts reach the levels where the need exists or where the information can be most fully exploited?

Mr. Carl Duckett, DDS&T, addressed the case in point, the OSI computer printed report on "Soviet Research and Development [redacted] [redacted] explaining that the Scientific Committee of the USIB provided the over-all guidance on the various departments' responsibilities, that he met personally and frequently with interested department research representatives, and that in addition, a standard document distribution was made throughout the intelligence community with appropriate caveats depending upon the security level of the document in question.

25X1

25X1

SECRET

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

**SECRET**

3. What is the status of the Covert Action projects under consideration by the Katzenbach Committee?

Covered by the attached separate memorandum.

4. What is the Agency policy with respect to user charges as applied to CIA efforts on matters of common intelligence interest?

In several instances of identified activity which satisfy the requirements of other departments, discussion was held on why CIA funded and carried out the assignment. Instances of this nature were the study of the environmental effects on the Soviet Cosmonaut, primarily of interest to NASA, and communication services for Department of State. It was agreed that these assignments conceivably could be funded and performed elsewhere, but our main concern was the expertise and costs. This may be indicative of a desire for clearly delineated lines of responsibility among the various government Agencies.

25X1  
5. Why are there  man-years of employment in the 1968 request not covered by permanent positions?

It was explained that this represents the total part-time, contract, indigenous, and consultant employment, the mix of which changes and with the exception of indigenous employment, represents only fractional man-years of a variety of individuals. The implication of this discussion was that this type of employment should be covered in the same manner as permanent employment and the Agency would be well advised to prepare for this in future budgeting.

In addition to the preceding discussions, a variety of details arose with respect to increases and decreases in the 1968 program and a particular question as to the amount of cut made by the Bureau of the Budget to the Agency's initial request.

A commitment was made to furnish Representative Lipscomb the following additional material:

1. The distribution made by recipients of the OSI Report referred to above.
2. Details of the Southeast Asia increases contained in the 1968 budget.
3. Information in greater detail on Columbia and George Washington Universities' participation in identified external research contracts.

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

**SECRET**

25X1